

Given Name	Save Greater Manchester Greenbelt
Company / Organisation	SaveGreaterManchestersGreenBelt(SGMGB)OldhamGroups
Person ID	1287363
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Agent Company / Organisation	Leith Planning Ltd
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287363_SiteAssesmentBroadbentMoss.pdf PFE1287363_SiteAssessmentCowlshaw.pdf PFE1287363_SiteAssessmentBealValley.pdf PFE1287363_RepLeithPlanning_Redacted.pdf
Given Name	Save Greater Manchester Greenbelt
Company / Organisation	SaveGreaterManchestersGreenBelt(SGMGB)OldhamGroups
Person ID	1287363
Title	JP-H 1 Scale Distribution and Phasing of New Housing Development
Agent Company / Organisation	Leith Planning Ltd
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287363_SiteAssesmentBroadbentMoss.pdf PFE1287363_SiteAssessmentCowlshaw.pdf PFE1287363_SiteAssessmentBealValley.pdf PFE1287363_RepLeithPlanning_Redacted.pdf
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	NA
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	NA
Redacted reasons - Please give us details of why you consider the consultation point not to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.	We have particular concern in relation to the identified housing need and the fact that the Plan appears to be seeking to over-provide for housing land. The Plan itself and the associated supporting documentation appear to be inconsistent in the identification of a housing need figure, fails to pay sufficient regard to reasonable alternatives and is seeking to be over flexible in relation to land supply. The Plan is therefore deemed to be unsound, as whilst one can argue the Plan has been positively prepared (in terms of its aspiration), it cannot be seen to be being realistic.
Redacted modification - Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this section of the plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above.	The Plan should be modified to reduce the overall level of housing land required to meet the needs of Greater Manchester over the plan period.
Given Name	Save Greater Manchester Greenbelt

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Company / Organisation	SaveGreaterManchestersGreenBelt(SGMGB)OldhamGroups
Person ID	1287363
Title	JP-H 2 Affordability of New Housing
Agent Company / Organisation	Leith Planning Ltd
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287363_SiteAssesmentBroadbentMoss.pdf PFE1287363_SiteAssesmentCowlshaw.pdf PFE1287363_SiteAssesmentBealValley.pdf PFE1287363_RepLeithPlanning_Redacted.pdf
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	NA
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	NA
Redacted reasons - Please give us details of why you consider the consultation point not to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.	The Plan sets out a target for the delivery of affordable housing but leaves the allocation and delivery of such homes to each authority Local Plan process. Such an approach may result in an inconsistent and incoherent application of policy on the delivery of affordable homes across the Greater Manchester region, with some areas potentially seeking lower levels of provision. There is a danger that as drafted local authorities could fail to set out policies which secure the needs of those requiring affordable provision, and as such the Plan could be deemed to be unsound.
Redacted modification - Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this section of the plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above.	We would therefore ask that the affordable housing policy within PFE be duly amended to set a standard affordable housing requirement for new development across the Greater Manchester area, to ensure that housing needs are delivered to a consistent level across the Plan area.
Given Name	Save Greater Manchester Greenbelt
Company / Organisation	SaveGreaterManchestersGreenBelt(SGMGB)OldhamGroups
Person ID	1287363
Title	JP-G 10 Green Belt
Agent Company / Organisation	Leith Planning Ltd
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287363_SiteAssesmentBroadbentMoss.pdf PFE1287363_SiteAssesmentCowlshaw.pdf PFE1287363_SiteAssesmentBealValley.pdf PFE1287363_RepLeithPlanning_Redacted.pdf
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	NA
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	No
Redacted reasons - Please give us details of why you consider the consultation point not to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.	The Plan sets out an area of Green Belt release to meet the perceived housing need across the nine authorities. However, insufficient consideration has been given to the allocation of alternative urban sites, including increased densities and better use of the High Street and other brownfield land in advance of releasing land from within the Green Belt. The Plan is therefore unsound as there has been insufficient assessment of reasonable alternatives.
Redacted modification - Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this section of the plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above.	In order to address this issue the Plan should be modified to remove all proposed allocations that are currently designated on land falling within the Green Belt, with additional land identified for development within the main urban areas.
Given Name	Save Greater Manchester Greenbelt
Company / Organisation	SaveGreaterManchestersGreenBelt(SGMGB)OldhamGroups
Person ID	1287363
Title	JPA 12: Beal Valley
Agent Company / Organisation	Leith Planning Ltd
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287363_SiteAssesmentBroadbentMoss.pdf PFE1287363_SiteAssessmentCowlshaw.pdf PFE1287363_SiteAssessmentBealValley.pdf PFE1287363_RepLeithPlanning_Redacted.pdf
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	No
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	No
Redacted reasons - Please give us details of why you consider the consultation point not to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.	<p>Transport - Enhancements are required to facilitate improved access, particularly to the south of the site in terms of pedestrian and cycle access, and to the Shaw Metrolink stop which forms part of the Broadbent Moss allocation (ref 14 - immediately to the south).</p> <p>Various vehicular and pedestrian access points are potentially available to the west and a new link to the south would be required - access to east not possible due to presence of metrolink</p> <p>Utilities - There is currently a lack of utility infrastructure provision across the Site and it will be necessary for preliminary investigation to be undertaken to assess whether there is capacity in the</p>

surrounding network to accommodate the scale of development suggested in the allocation. The metrolink line is a potential physical and logistical barrier to running services from the east.

Environmental - As Green Belt, predominantly green field land, any development within the proposed allocation area will have an impact on the existing site environment.

The assessment acknowledges that the release of the land from the Green Belt would constitute high harm to the purposes of the Green Belt - the mitigation proposed is not of substantial weight to justify the harm. The majority of the proposed mitigation could be implemented without the need to release the land for housing (such as strengthening the boundary through planting trees which could be undertaken on the existing boundary line if it is considered to be of such importance) and is only required due to the proposed release and use for housing.

The assessment itself considers there to be cumulative harm for which there is no justifiable reasoning other than to allow for the development of additional homes, the focus of which should not, in the first instance, be Green Belt release.

The landscape character assessment suggests that there would be significant mitigation required to facilitate the release of the land for housing and that there would still be an impact of medium sensitivity.

The topography of the site presents significant constraints to development.

It is acknowledged that much of the site is marshy grassland and contains environmentally sensitive areas including sites of biological importance (SBI), tree preservation orders (TPO) and other protected open land (OPOL). The marshy nature suggests that there would be need for a detailed drainage strategy on a large scale. The implications of the drainage required would need to be considered in terms of the long terms effects it will have on the sensitive environmental areas and this should be assessed in advance of allocating land for development.

There is insufficient evidence to be able to accurately assess the direct impact of any development on protected species.

The proposals indicate that the metrolink line to the east of the allocation will become the new Green Belt boundary.

Historic Environment - No LB"s, SAMs or CAs on the site although there are a number in close proximity that may be impacted by development within their setting.

There is high potential for archaeological remains, particularly from the Prehistoric, Post-Medieval and Industrial periods, therefore further archaeological work is recommended (source: Oldham Historic Environment Assessment 2019) which needs to be given more consideration.

Social - Any development within the proposed allocation site would need to assess the requirement for additional social infrastructure (education, healthcare etc).

Requirements to overcome constraints - Pressure on existing environment and infrastructure may require any development at the site to provide:

- new and/or improvement of existing open space, sport and recreation facilities;

- infrastructure (above and below ground) across the whole site;

-additional school places through the expansion of existing facilities or new provision of new school facilities;

-appropriate health and community facilities

Also requirements for:

-green infrastructure and preferably a joint approach to ecological enhancement with Broadbent Moss (ref 14)

Deliverability- Only 21 of the 53 ha suggested for Green Belt release is proposed to be developable.

Not known although the initial viability assessment indicated that development would not be viable.

Blanket values of £250,000 per ha were applied across the whole of Greater Manchester.

The viability assessment considered the anticipated scale of development could provide only 14.9% affordable housing and that strategic transport and infrastructure costs would be high. Factors including the overall net developable area and the likely high abnormalities that would be associated with mitigating constraints such as ecology, topography and drainage would significantly influence the deliverability of any development.

Expected to deliver around 480 homes on the greenfield element of the Site - allocation includes some brownfield to the north but this is already accounted for in the SHLAA.

Potential for contamination from landfill and industrial use raises questions about the suitability of the site for a high risk use such as residential. Topography may have implications for viability. Net developable area will be impacted on by need for ecological and flood risk mitigation - this should have been considered in advance of setting an indication of predicted residential unit yield.

The site is in a groundwater source protection zone, the extent of any development needs to account for this. The transport impact of developments has been considered against a backdrop of proposed enhancement measures set out in the Greater Manchester Transport Strategy 2040, the implementation of which is not guaranteed and therefore there is a potential flaw in the assessments. The statement that "Sites that have been selected for inclusion in the Joint DPD have been found to be suitable from a transport perspective and satisfy the requirements of NPPF in that they do not place an unacceptable impact on highway safety or severe impact on the road network"(Para 10.7) cannot be so definitive without the anticipated baseline being secured and this is confirmed in the following paragraph which states "For some allocations it is recognised that there is further work to be done in order to develop a solution that fully mitigates the site's impact on the transport network"(Para 10.8).

The proposed access point to the south provides no footpath for pedestrian access and there appears to have been no assessment to ascertain whether there is sufficient land available to facilitate such provision, which would almost certainly be required for the quantum of development being proposed - although the suggestion is to close it to through traffic for vehicles this does not appropriately address the pedestrian connectivity issues - reliance on the implementation of the Bee Network is not appropriate to sufficiently address the safety concerns.

There is no justification for the release of 53 ha of Green Belt land and there is no overriding benefit to offset the acknowledged harm. Although no Green Belt should be lost, if only 21 of the 53 ha is

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

	<p>going to be subject to development, the release of the a substantially larger area will only result in future pressure for development on the remaining land at the potential cost of any mitigation secured.</p> <p>Having regard to the environmental constraints of the site, much of the allocation would be required to remedy the harm that would be caused by residential development - it is not appropriate to release land from the Green Belt solely for a large proportion of it to become a mitigation buffer.</p> <p>The SBI is already highlighted as a significant constraint and should preclude the site coming forward as an allocation - mitigation in the form of habitat compensation is not an acceptable solution.</p> <p>In summary, it is inappropriate for any land to be released from the Green Belt to accommodate new development when the impacts, particularly the environmental impacts, are considered to be so significant and much of the land would need to be set aside for green infrastructure, a purpose which it is already satisfactorily performing under the Green Belt designation.</p> <p>As it stands the aspirational development of the site would appear unviable and this would in turn most likely lead to pressure for development of the 32 ha of the proposed Green Belt release that has been indicated would be set aside for green infrastructure. This would not be acceptable and would further undermine the soundness of the proposals.</p>
Redacted modification - Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this section of the plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above.	The site should be deleted from the Plan
Given Name	Save Greater Manchester Greenbelt
Company / Organisation	SaveGreaterManchestersGreenBelt(SGMGB)OldhamGroups
Person ID	1287363
Title	JPA 14: Broadbent Moss
Agent Company / Organisation	Leith Planning Ltd
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287363_SiteAssesmentBroadbentMoss.pdf PFE1287363_SiteAssessmentCowlshaw.pdf PFE1287363_SiteAssessmentBealValley.pdf PFE1287363_RepLeithPlanning_Redacted.pdf
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	No
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	No

Redacted reasons - Please give us details of why you consider the consultation point not to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.

Ground Conditions - Due to the former landfill/quarry use it is anticipated that there is high potential for contamination and in light of the sensitivity of residential use there will be a need for robust testing and potential mitigation works.

Flood Risk & Drainage - A significant proportion of the central area of the site includes area of Flood Zone 2 and 3. Additional built form in this area would have a potential knock-on effect for the wider site and surrounding area.

Transport - Enhancements would be required to facilitate access to the Shaw Metrolink stop and an appropriate crossing across the line, along with enhanced links to the west and east, and to the Beal Valley allocation (ref JP 12 - immediately to the north).

Utilities - There is limited infrastructure within the site, with only peripheral water and sewage provision. The dissection of the site with the metrolink means that a comprehensive utilities provision for the whole site would not be practicable.

Environmental - Of the 82ha allocated, it is only anticipated to develop 42ha and the assessment of impact on the Green Belt was approached as three sub-areas to reflect variations in harm to the Green Belt purposes and the distinct land parcels of the allocation. It was concluded that the allocation makes a relatively significant contribution to checking the sprawl of Greater Manchester and preventing encroachment on the countryside, and a relatively significant contribution to maintaining separation between Royton and the Sholver / Moorside suburb of Oldham, and the release of the land from the Green Belt was considered to have moderate to high harm on Green Belt purposes and a weakening of the Green Belt boundary.

Broadbent Moss falls within the Rochdale and Oldham South Pennines Foothills landscape character area and the Pennine Foothills South/ West Pennine landscape character type as identified within the Landscape Character Assessment, with any development likely to have a medium to high impact on this character and substantial mitigation required.

The Site includes priority habitats and potential for protected species which would need to be assessed further prior to development being undertaken and appropriate mitigation implemented.

Historic Environment - No LB"s, SAMs or CAs on the site although there are a number in close proximity that may be impacted by development within their setting.

There is potential for archaeological remains within the moss areas but not the larger former landfill site, particularly from the Prehistoric, Post-Medieval and Industrial periods, therefore further archaeological work is recommended (source: Oldham Historic Environment Assessment 2019)

Social - Any development within the proposed allocation site would need to assess the requirement for additional social infrastructure (education, healthcare etc).

Requirements to overcome constraints - Mitigation for contamination due to former use.

Mitigation for impacts on Green Belt purposes, landscape character, ecological designations and potential protected species habitats.

Access provision to and across the Metrolink

Deliverability - Not known although the initial viability assessment indicated that development would be marginally viable albeit the

	<p>employment element would not include a sufficient margin to be able to contribute to infrastructure costs for the wider site.</p> <p>Blanket values of £250,000 per ha were applied across the whole of Greater Manchester.</p> <p>The viability assessment considered the anticipated scale of development could provide only 15% affordable housing and that strategic transport and infrastructure costs would be high. Factors including the overall net developable area and the likely high abnormalities that would be associated with mitigating constraints such as contamination, ecology, topography and drainage would significantly influence the deliverability of any development.</p> <p>The plots which comprise the Site are in 13 ownerships - this may have implications for deliverability.</p> <p>Expected to deliver around 1,450 homes excluding the 77 referred to above (500 of which post 2037) & 21,720 sq m of employment floorspace by extending neighbouring commercial areas (Higginshaw Business Employment Area).</p> <p>There is a high potential for contamination due to the former landfill/quarry use and as such it is questionable as to whether the Site should be released from the</p> <p>Green Belt in advance of any further investigative work being undertaken - residential use is highly sensitive and in addition, many former quarry/landfill locations are key habitat for protected ecological species and this also therefore needs further investigation in advance of any site release.</p> <p>The net developable area will be impacted on by need for ecological and flood risk mitigation - this should have been considered in advance of setting an indication of predicted residential unit yield. The site is in a groundwater source protection zone and the extent of any development needs to account for this.</p> <p>With approximately half of the site needing to be set aside for green infrastructure and mitigation to offset the significant impacts of removing the land from the Green Belt in the first place, alongside facilitating future development with currently unknown mitigation requirements to address aspects such as flood risk/drainage and ecological mitigation, the proposed Green Belt release is not justified or robust. In addition to mitigation for impact on Green Belt purposes, development proposals would also need to mitigate the medium to high impact on designated landscape character.</p> <p>The Site has already been identified as containing priority habitats and has potential for protected species but to date insufficient surveys have been undertaken to ascertain the precise level of impact any development would have. These assessments should be a prerequisite for any release of land from the Green Belt if the purpose of such release is to facilitate development</p>
Given Name	Save Greater Manchester Greenbelt
Company / Organisation	SaveGreaterManchestersGreenBelt(SGMGB)OldhamGroups
Person ID	1287363
Title	JPA 16: Cowlshaw
Agent Company / Organisation	Leith Planning Ltd
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287363_SiteAssesmentBroadbentMoss.pdf PFE1287363_SiteAssesmentCowlshaw.pdf

	PFE1287363_SiteAssessmentBealValley.pdf PFE1287363_RepLeithPlanning_Redacted.pdf
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	No
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	No
Redacted reasons - Please give us details of why you consider the consultation point not to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.	<p>Known Contamination - None known but a Phase 1 & 2 contamination report would be required with any future development proposals.</p> <p>Flood Risk & Drainage - Flood Zone 1 (See EA map extract below) therefore it would be an acceptable housing site in principle but any development proposals would require an FRA (Subject to site area and use).</p> <p>Transport - The Site is not considered to be highly accessible and the cumulative impact with other proposed Green Belt release sites is anticipated to have a material impact on the highway network, with most mitigation measures required in the short term (0-5 yrs) and the remainder in the medium (5-10 yrs). There is no existing access to the Site other than from Cocker Mill Lane which is the primary access for the existing industrial units in the southern parcel of the allocation but this route does not include pedestrian footpaths. Future access is anticipated to include Cocker Mill Lane to the south, Kings Road/Moor Street to the east, and Denbigh Drive to the north but more work is required to ascertain whether the potential access points are functionally capable of facilitating the quantum of anticipated development.</p> <p>Utilities - The Site is traversed by electricity cables north to south and these would impact on net developable area (or need to be rerouted).</p> <p>Environment - Cowlshaw falls within the Rochdale and Oldham South Pennines Foothills landscape character area and the Pennine Foothills South / West Pennine landscape character type as identified within the Landscape Character Assessment and the anticipated nature of residential development is considered to have a medium sensitivity of impact on this character.</p> <p>There are also areas of biodiversity within the site, including the existing Site of Biological Importance (SBI) "Ponds at Cowlshaw Farm" and the priority deciduous woodland habitat located to the rear of Worsley Drive which are identified as potentially significant constraints to development. No detailed assessment of protected species habitats has been undertaken and this is recommended as part of any future development proposal.</p> <p>Historic Environment - No heritage assets on the Site but there is potential for</p>

preservation of palaeo-environmental evidence and the impact of any development on the setting of nearby heritage assets will need to be taken into account.

Requirements to overcome constraints - Suitable access would need to be provided to all areas of the allocation with further assessment required to ascertain if this is possible.

Rerouting of electricity cables or reduction in net-developable area to compensate.

Ecological sensitivity and impacts on protected species and habitats.

Land ownership and therefore availability may be a constraint

Deliverability - Not known although the initial viability assessment indicated that development would not be viable and would only become viable with an uplift in anticipated unit values.

Blanket values of £250,000 per ha were applied across the whole of Greater Manchester

The viability assessment considered the anticipated scale of development could provide only 15% affordable housing and that strategic transport and infrastructure costs would

be high. Factors including the overall net developable area (13.5ha of the overall 32.2ha site) and the likely high abnormalities that would be associated with mitigating

constraints would significantly influence the deliverability of any development.

Objective to deliver 465 dwellings excluding the extant permission. More work needs to be done to ascertain whether there is a realistic opportunity to provide access to all of the Site due to constraints in ownership (having implications for the routing of vehicle movements) and existing road widths, as well as mitigating the cumulative impacts of any development on the wider highway network (when considered alongside other proposed green belt release allocations).

Presence of electricity overhead cables is a constraint that will need to be

addressed - proximity to such infrastructure close to residential development is

questionable.

Development of the Site would have a medium sensitivity of impact on the

protected character area which would require mitigation. The Site is also home to

designated sites of biological importance, with the presence of protected species

not having yet been assessed in sufficient detail to justify releasing the land for

development.

There is a substantial portion of the proposed allocation that would be set aside for

green infrastructure/mitigation (approximately 19ha of the 32ha site). It is

questionable why any development would require such a significant amount of

mitigation and, if removed from the Green Belt, what measures would be in place

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

	to protect this land from future development.
Given Name	Save Greater Manchester Greenbelt
Company / Organisation	SaveGreaterManchestersGreenBelt(SGMGB)OldhamGroups
Person ID	1287363
Title	Supporting Evidence
Agent Company / Organisation	Leith Planning Ltd
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287363_SiteAssesmentBroadbentMoss.pdf PFE1287363_SiteAssessmentCowlshaw.pdf PFE1287363_SiteAssessmentBealValley.pdf PFE1287363_RepLeithPlanning_Redacted.pdf
Redacted comment on supporting documents - Please give details of why you consider any of the evidence not to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.	As set out within the Regulations, development plans need to be based on a robust and justified evidence base. The Evidence Base as currently drafted is in fact inconsistent, incoherent and does not support the case for a sound plan. The evidence base needs to be revisited to (1) ensure consistency in approach, assessment and aspirations and (2) to ensure that the Plan being presented at Examination is based on up to date and accurate detail.
Given Name	Save Greater Manchester Greenbelt
Company / Organisation	SaveGreaterManchestersGreenBelt(SGMGB)OldhamGroups
Person ID	1287363
Title	Other Comments
Agent Company / Organisation	Leith Planning Ltd
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287363_SiteAssessmentCowlshaw.pdf PFE1287363_SiteAssesmentBroadbentMoss.pdf PFE1287363_SiteAssessmentBealValley.pdf PFE1287363_RepLeithPlanning_Redacted.pdf
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	No
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	No
Given Name	Save Greater Manchester Greenbelt
Company / Organisation	SaveGreaterManchestersGreenBelt(SGMGB)OldhamGroups
Person ID	1287363
Title	Other Comments
Agent Company / Organisation	Leith Planning Ltd
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287363_RepLeithPlanning_Redacted.pdf

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	No
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	No
Given Name	Save Greater Manchester Greenbelt
Company / Organisation	SaveGreaterManchestersGreenBelt(SGMGB)OldhamGroups
Person ID	1287363
Title	Other Comments
Agent Company / Organisation	Leith Planning Ltd
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287363_RepLeithPlanning_Redacted.pdf
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	No
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	No
Given Name	Save Greater Manchester Greenbelt
Company / Organisation	SaveGreaterManchestersGreenBelt(SGMGB)OldhamGroups
Person ID	1287363
Title	Other Comments
Agent Company / Organisation	Leith Planning Ltd
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287363_RepLeithPlanning_Redacted.pdf
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	No
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	No
Given Name	Save Greater Manchester Greenbelt
Company / Organisation	SaveGreaterManchestersGreenBelt(SGMGB)OldhamGroups
Person ID	1287363

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Title	Other Comments
Agent Company / Organisation	Leith Planning Ltd
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287356_ResponseLeithPlanning_Amend.pdf
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	No
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	No